

To: Buhl, Rick[Buhl.Rick@epa.gov]
Cc: Kortuem, Patrice[Kortuem.Patrice@epa.gov]; Anthofer, Wayne[Anthofer.Wayne@epa.gov]; Stavnes, Sandra[Stavnes.Sandra@epa.gov]; Vallejos, Cinna[vallejos.cinna@epa.gov]; Madigan, Andrea[Madigan.Andrea@epa.gov]; R8 Documentation Unit Leader[R08_Documentation_Unit_Leader@epa.gov]
From: Hestmark, Martin
Sent: Tue 8/18/2015 10:41:21 PM
Subject: RE: GK Response: Proposed Funding Mechanism for Independent Analysis

Just getting to this email. I presume your shop worked this and/or is working it still.

From: Buhl, Rick
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2015 3:15 PM
To: Hestmark, Martin
Cc: Kortuem, Patrice; Anthofer, Wayne; Stavnes, Sandra; Vallejos, Cinna; Madigan, Andrea
Subject: GK Response: Proposed Funding Mechanism for Independent Analysis

Martin,

Per our phone call, this is what Wayne and I discussed. For background, Cinna and Wayne discussed this issue as well, and I asked Wayne to follow up with Cinna after our conversation.

Background: Initial estimates for La Plata county are around \$50K. Overall costs may be around \$600K. It is my understanding that Andrea Madigan is working to scope the effort as we speak with the county. Based on this, we are looking for a way to address the immediate need to preform independent testing to re-open the river, and longer term need to continue testing (scope TBD).

Immediate need:

1. La Plata County: My understanding is that Colorado has agreed to reimburse La Plata county for their costs for independent testing, and EPA will reimburse the state through our Superfund Block grant. Wayne has concurred with this approach so I see no further obstacles to implementing.
2. San Juan County and cities of Silverton and Durango: It is unclear if these governments have

discussed the need for independent testing or not. We are not aware of an agreement being reached, but if required will look to use the same agreement structure with Colorado to have them reimburse the county/city and EPA reimburse them through the SF Block Grant.

Long Term need:

We have the ability to give a grant to a subsidiary government of a state such as a county or city. This will likely take a few weeks to setup up as we have to go through the formal paperwork. We also want to have a good scope for the effort so it is not open ended. Wayne and Cinna believe this is a workable approach, but Wayne wants to get a legal opinion before confirming this as the best course of action going forward. So I would characterize it as our current proposal subject to legal review and not a final answer.

Other Regions:

I asked Wayne to reach out to R6 and R9 Grants Management Officers to discuss this with them in case they are getting similar inquiries. This solution may not work for all states as SF Block grants vary.

From our conversation, it sounded like this approach has not been approved by Shaun, so we will communicate it as a strategy in development. Given the sense of urgency with which we are working this, I would appreciate hearing back from you as soon as possible if you want us to pursue it further, and or implement it. In addition, I think we need to make sure that Cinna, Andrea, and Wayne are all on the same page with respect to the scope of this effort (what counties/cities are being considered and what is the short term and long term testing scope). The scope will impact the dollar amounts and that may also influence our grants management strategy.

Wayne and I have a follow up meeting at COB today to discuss status and update the way ahead.

Please let me know what questions/concerns you have. Thanks.

Rick

Rick Buhl

Assistant Regional Administrator, Office of Technical and Management Services

USEPA Region 8 | 1595 Wynkoop St (8TMS-IO) | Denver, CO 80202-1129

Office: (303) 312-6920